

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,179	02/26/2002	Nobuhiko Takekoshi	03500.016224	2417
5514	7590 05/05/2004		EXAMINER	
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO			CHAN, SING P	
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1734	

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## **Advisory Action**

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/082,179	TAKEKOSHI, NOBUHIKO	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Sing P Chan	1734	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Theref final re conditi	EPLY FILED 20 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Fore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a ejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in on for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued nation (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.
	PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]
a) [	
ь) [∑	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
have bed 37 CFR (b) abov	ensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee ensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee en filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in e, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
	A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.	The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a)	they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b)	they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c)	they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d)	they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
	NOTE:
3.□	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
4.	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.	The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
6.	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.🖂	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
	Claim(s) allowed:
	Claim(s) objected to:
	Claim(s) rejected: <u>1, 3-6, 8 and 9</u> .
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
8.🛛	The drawing correction filed on <u>20 April 2004</u> is a)⊠ approved or b)□ disapproved by the Examiner.
9.	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)
10.	Other:
	RICHARD CRISPINO
Ch	SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

Claims 1 and 9 stand rejected by the rejection made to claims 1 and 7 of the previous office action Applicant's arguments filed April 20, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In response to applicant's argument that Matsuda (U.S. 4,985,720) is nonanalogous art, it has been held tha a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Matsuda provided a teaching reasonably pertinent to the particular problem of the applicant, specifically the control of the temperature on drying rolls, which to set the temperature on a lower temperature during standby and a higher temperature during use to conserve energy.